

(20) It is more likely that those people are also driving without insurance due to the costs and restrictions associated with obtaining auto insurance on a suspended license, thereby placing a greater financial burden on other drivers when a driver with a suspended license causes an accident.

(21) The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators has concluded the following: “Drivers who have been suspended for social non-conformance-related offenses are often trapped within the system. Some cannot afford to pay the original fines, and may lose their ability to legally get to and from work as a result of the suspension. Many make the decision to drive while suspended. The suspension results in increased financial obligations through new requirements such as reinstatement fees, court costs, and other penalties. While there is a clear societal interest in keeping those who are unfit to drive off the roads, broadly restricting licenses for violations unrelated to an individual’s ability to drive safely may do more harm than good. This is especially true in areas of the country that lack alternative means of transportation. For those individuals, a valid driver license can be a means to survive. Local communities, employers, and employees all experience negative consequences as a result of social non-conformity suspensions, including unemployment, lower wages, fewer employment opportunities and hiring choices, and increased insurance costs.”

(22) A report by the Harvard Law School Criminal Justice Policy Program concluded the following: “The suspension of a driver’s or professional license is one of the most pervasive poverty traps for poor people assessed a fine that they cannot afford to pay. The practice is widespread. Nearly 40 percent of license suspensions nationwide stem from unpaid fines, missed child support payments, and drug offenses—not from unsafe or intoxicated driving or failing to obtain automotive insurance. Suspension of a driver’s or professional license is hugely counterproductive; it punishes non-payment by taking away a person’s means for making a living. License suspension programs are also expensive for States to run and they distract law enforcement efforts from priorities related to public safety. License suspensions may also be unconstitutional if the license was suspended before the judge determined the defendant had the ability to pay the criminal justice debt.”

SEC. ____ 03. GRANTS FOR DRIVER’S LICENSES REINSTATEMENT PROGRAMS.

Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 501(a) (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) GRANTS FOR DRIVER’S LICENSE REINSTATEMENT PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to grants made under paragraph (1), the Attorney General may make grants to States described in subparagraph (B) to cover costs incurred by the State to reinstate driver’s licenses previously suspended for unpaid fines and fees.

“(B) STATES DESCRIBED.—A State described in this subparagraph is a State that—

“(i) does not have in effect any State or local law that permits—

“(I) the suspension or revocation of, or refusal to renew, a driver’s license of an individual based on the individual’s failure to pay a civil or criminal fine or fee; or

“(II) the refusal to renew the registration of a motor vehicle based on the owner’s failure to pay a civil or criminal fine or fee; and

“(ii) during the 3-year period ending on the date on which the State applies for or receives a grant under this paragraph, has repealed a State or local law that permitted

the suspension or revocation of, or refusal to renew, driver’s licenses or the registration of a motor vehicle based on the failure to pay civil or criminal fines or fees.

“(C) CRITERIA.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to eligible States that submit a plan to reinstate driver’s licenses previously suspended for unpaid fines and fees—

“(i) to maximize the number of individuals with suspended driver’s licenses eligible to have driving privileges reinstated or regained;

“(ii) to provide assistance to individuals living in areas where public transportation options are limited; and

“(iii) to ease the burden on States where the State or local law described in subparagraph (B) was in effect during the 3-year period ending on the date on which a State applies for a grant under this paragraph in accordance with section 502.

“(D) AMOUNT.—Each grant awarded under this paragraph shall be not greater than 5 percent of the amount allocated to the State in accordance with the formula established under section 505.

“(E) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a grant is made to a State under this paragraph, the State shall submit to the Attorney General a report that describes the program implemented under subparagraph (A), including with respect to—

“(i) the population served by the program;

“(ii) the number of driver’s licenses reinstated under the program; and

“(iii) all costs to the State of the program, including how the grants under this paragraph were spent to defray such costs.”; and

(2) in section 508—

(A) by striking “There” and inserting “(a) In General.—There”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DRIVER’S LICENSE REINSTATEMENT PROGRAMS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 501(a)(3) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.”

SEC. ____ 04. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the implementation of the grant program in paragraph (3) of section 501(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)), as added by section [____] 03(a) of this Act, that—

(1) includes what is known about the effect of repealing State laws, in selected States, that had permitted the suspension or revocation of, or refusal to renew, driver’s licenses or the registration of a motor vehicle based on the failure to pay civil or criminal fines or fees, including such factors, to the extent information is available, as—

(A) the collection of fines and fees;

(B) the usage of law enforcement resources;

(C) economic mobility and unemployment;

(D) rates of enforcement of traffic safety laws through the tracking of number of summonses and violations issued (including those related to automated enforcement technologies);

(E) the use of suspensions for public safety-related reasons (including reckless driving, speeding, and driving under the influence);

(F) safety-critical traffic events (including in localities with automated enforcement programs);

(G) the rates of license suspensions and proportion of unlicensed drivers;

(H) racial and geographic disparities; and

(I) administrative costs (including costs associated with the collection of fines and fees and with the reinstatement of driver’s licenses); and

(2) includes what is known about—

(A) existing alternatives to driver’s license suspension as methods of enforcement and collection of unpaid fines and fees; and

(B) existing alternatives to traditional driver’s license suspension for certain kinds of unsafe driving, including models that allow drivers to continue to drive legally while pursuing driver improvement opportunities.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure a report on the study required under subsection (a).

SA 2178. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2137 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROMNEY)) to the bill H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division F, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . OPEN NETWORK ARCHITECTURE.

(a) OPEN NETWORK ARCHITECTURE TESTBED.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “Applied Research Open-RAN testbed” means the testbed established under paragraph (2);

(B) the term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information; and

(C) the term “NTIA” means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish an applied research open network architecture testbed at the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of the NTIA to develop and demonstrate network architectures and applications, equipment integration and interoperability at scale, including—

(A) Open Radio Access Network (commonly known as “Open-RAN”) technology;

(B) Virtualized Radio Access Network (commonly known as “vRAN”) technology; and

(C) cloud native technologies that replicate telecommunications hardware as software-based virtual network elements and functions.

(3) FOCUS; CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed pursuant to this subsection, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that such testbed evaluates issues related to deployment and operation of open network architectures in rural areas.

(4) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Assistant Secretary shall enter into cooperative research and development agreements as appropriate to obtain equipment, devices, and expertise for the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed, in accordance with section 12 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a).

(5) PRIVATE SECTOR CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Assistant Secretary may accept private contributions to the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed in the form of network equipment or devices for testing purposes.

(6) PARTNERSHIP WITH GOVERNMENT ENTITIES.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—In establishing the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed, the Assistant Secretary shall—

(i) consult with the Federal Communications Commission, including with respect to ongoing work by the Commission to develop other testbeds, including private sector testbeds, related to Open-RAN technologies; and

(ii) ensure that the work on the testbed is coordinated with the responsibilities of the Assistant Secretary under any relevant memorandum of understanding with the Federal Communications Commission and the National Science Foundation related to spectrum.

(B) OPERATIONS.—In operating the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed, the Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, partner with—

(i) the First Responder Network Authority of the NTIA (also known as “FirstNet”) and the Public Safety Communications Research Division of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to examine use cases and applications for Open-RAN technologies in a public safety network;

(ii) other Federal agencies, as appropriate to examine use cases and applications for Open-RAN technologies in other areas of interest to such agencies; and

(iii) international partners, as appropriate.

(7) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—The Assistant Secretary shall seek input from stakeholders regarding the establishment and operation of the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed.

(8) IMPLEMENTATION DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall—

(A) define metrics and parameters for the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed, including functionality, project configuration and capacity, performance, security requirements, and quality assurance;

(B) adopt any rules as necessary, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission; and

(C) begin the development of the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed, including seeking stakeholder input as required by paragraph (7).

(9) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the testbed and any recommendations for additional legislative or regulatory actions relating to the work of the testbed.

(10) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the administration of the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2022, to remain available until expended.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (6) shall be construed to obligate FirstNet or any other Federal entity to pay for the cost of the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed established under this subsection in the absence of the appropriation of amounts under this paragraph.

(C) AUTHORIZATION FOR VOLUNTARY SUPPORT.—A Federal entity, including FirstNet, may voluntarily enter into an agreement with NTIA to provide monetary or nonmonetary support for the Applied Research Open-RAN testbed.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN STANDARDS-SETTING BODIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information;

(B) the term “eligible standards-setting body”—

(i) means a standards-setting body, participation in which may be funded by a grant awarded under paragraph (2), as determined by the Assistant Secretary; and

(ii) includes—

(I) the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (commonly known as “3GPP”);

(II) the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (commonly known as “ATIS”);

(III) the International Telecommunications Union (commonly known as “ITU”);

(IV) the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers (commonly known as “IEEE”);

(V) the World Radiocommunications Conferences (commonly known as the “WRC”) of the ITU;

(VI) the Internet Engineering Task Force (commonly known as the “IETF”);

(VII) the International Organization for Standardization (commonly known as the “ISO”) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (commonly known as the “IEC”);

(VIII) the O-RAN Alliance;

(IX) the Telecommunications Industry Association (commonly known as “TIA”); and

(X) any other standards-setting body identified under paragraph (4);

(C) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce; and

(D) the term “standards-setting body” means an international body that develops the standards for open network architecture technologies.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Assistant Secretary, shall award grants to private sector entities based in the United States to participate in eligible standards-setting bodies.

(B) PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary shall prioritize grants awarded under this subsection to private sector entities that would not otherwise be able to participate in eligible standards-setting bodies without the grant.

(3) GRANT CRITERIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which amounts are appropriated under paragraph (5), the Secretary, in collaboration with the Assistant Secretary, shall establish criteria for the grants awarded under paragraph (2).

(4) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Federal Communications Commission in—

(A) determining criteria for the grants awarded under paragraph (2); and

(B) determining which standards-setting bodies, if any, in addition to the standards-setting bodies listed in paragraph (1)(B)(ii) are eligible standards-setting bodies.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under paragraph (2) \$30,000,000 in total for fiscal years 2022 through 2025, to remain available until expended.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary may use not more than 2 percent of any funds appropriated under this paragraph for the administration of the grant program established under this subsection.

SA 2179. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2137 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr.

TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROMNEY)) to the bill H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2060, line 17, strike “NTIA AUTHORITY” and all that follows through “(E)” on page 2061, line 3.

SA 2180. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2137 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROMNEY)) to the bill H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 309(e) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (as added by section 40511(a)), strike the closing quotation marks and the following period and insert the following:

“(f) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available under subsection (e) may be used—

“(1) to encourage or facilitate the adoption of building codes that restrict or prohibit the direct use of natural gas in residential and commercial buildings for space heating, water heating, cooking, or other purposes; or

“(2) to compel the adoption of model building energy codes.”.

SA 2181. Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2137 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROMNEY)) to the bill H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. 115. HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with State departments of transportation, shall carry out a highway cost allocation study to determine the direct costs of highway use by various types of users.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include an examination of—

(1) the Federal costs occasioned in the design, construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance of Federal-aid highways by—

(A) the use of vehicles of different dimensions, weights, number of axles, and other specifications; and

(B) the frequency of those vehicles in the traffic stream;

(2) the safety-, emissions-, congestion-, and noise-related costs of highway use by various types of users, and other costs as determined by the Secretary; and

(3) the proportionate share of the costs described in paragraph (1) that are attributable to each class of highway users.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—